

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project Title: Headwaters Corners Fluvial Geomorphic Study
2. Case Processing Numbers: Not Applicable at This Time
3. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Calabasas  
26135 Mureau Road  
Calabasas, CA 91302
4. Contact Person and Phone Number: Debbie O'hare, Mountains Restoration Trust  
(818) 346-9675 x 16
5. Project Location: 35 Acres at the Northwest Corner of Old Topanga Road and Mulholland Hwy,  
Calabasas, CA 91302
6. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Mountains Restoration Trust, Suite 206  
7050 Owensmouth Avenue  
Canoga Park, CA 91303
7. General Plan Designation  
Existing: Public Facilities-Institutional  
Proposed: Public Facilities-Institutional
8. Zoning  
Existing: Public Facilities  
Proposed: Public Facilities
9. Project Description:  

The Mountains Restoration Trust is currently developing plans to construct a biological demonstration/interpretation facility to promote environmental awareness in the Santa Monica Mountains and western San Fernando Valley. This facility would promote enhancement of on-site riparian habitat. Dry Canyon Creek currently meanders through the lower portions of the site. The creek and its adjacent environment suffers from a number of human-induced impacts. Therefore, this initial study checklist assesses the potential environmental impact resulting from the completion of geomorphic, hydrologic, and hydraulic analyses and the physical improvements necessary to complete a preliminary Ecosystem Restoration Plan for Dry Canyon Creek.
10. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Commercial, Residential, Institutional and Natural Open Space
11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreements): City of Calabasas

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors listed below would be potentially affected by this project. However, it was determined (based on information available at this time) that the proposed project would not involve "Potentially Significant Impacts" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- ♦ Aesthetics
- ♦ Agricultural Resources
- ♦ Air Quality
- ♦ Biological Resources
- ♦ Cultural Resources
- ♦ Geology/Soils
- ♦ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ♦ Hydrology/Water Quality
- ♦ Land Use/Planning
- ♦ Mineral Resources
- ♦ Noise
- ♦ Population/Housing
- ♦ Public Services
- ♦ Recreation
- ♦ Transportation/Traffic
- ♦ Utilities/Service Systems
- ♦ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	√
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potential significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	



Signature  
Jasch Janowicz, Environmental Coordinator  
City of Calabasas

February 10, 2003

Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (Requirements specified in CEQA Guidelines)

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**1. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?				√
b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				√
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				√
d) Result in direct or indirect population related growth inducement impacts (significantly expand employment opportunities, remove policy impediments to growth, or contribute to potential extensions of growth inducing infrastructure)?				√

- a. The project will not physically divide an established community. The proposal to complete geomorphic, hydrologic, and hydraulic studies and other physical enhancements within the creek environment that are associated with the implementation of a native habitat restoration program is not anticipated to conflict with any of the adjacent residential, institutional or commercial uses.
- b. The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Code. The area proposed for use as the Headwater Corners Environmental Center is within the City's Hillside Public Facilities Zoning District. The proposed use can be considered part agricultural and part institutional and thus would be permitted under the current zoning regulations. The renovation of any on-site historic structures and/or the construction of any other hard-surface improvements are also permitted but would likely require approval of a Site Plan Review.
- c. The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. The project will help to restore the natural habitat within the proposed project boundaries and provide valuable educational programs for interested parties and/or members of the community.
- d. The project will not result in direct or indirect population related growth inducement impacts. The completion of an Ecosystem Restoration Plan would likely reduce growth-induced impacts to the City of Calabasas and its natural environment.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**2. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			√	
b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?			√	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			√	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			√	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				√
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				√
g) Result in damage to, loss of, or removal of native oak trees or other locally identified specimen trees of significance?				√

- a. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species under the jurisdiction of the CDFG or other Trustee Agencies. The applicant is proposing to enhance the existing intermittent/perennial drainage, expand the onsite Oak Savannah, and restore on-site native plant communities. These activities would be beneficial to the surrounding natural habitat areas and will likely be implemented with the help of with state and federal resource agencies.
- b. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. However, permits from the Department of Fish and Game, Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board will likely be required.

The existing riparian systems will be enhanced through the development of specialized restoration programs involving experts in stream dynamics/restoration and members of the community. The physical improvements necessary for complete ecosystem enhancement will include:

1. Removal of fill material that has been illegally placed along the streambed;
2. Floodway widening by creating "benched" stream-banks;
3. Creating transitory storage areas adjacent to the main flow channel to reduce peak flows and create opportunities for the regeneration of riparian/wetland habitat;
4. Construction of vegetated swales to permit stormwater water infiltration/percolation into the surrounding soils; and
5. Removal of existing hard-channel improvements.

- c. The project will not have a significant impact on the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or on established native resident migratory wildlife corridors. No component of the proposal will deter wildlife movement into or out of the site.
- d. The project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on any local or regional Habitat Conservation Plan. In contrast, the Mountains Restoration Trust is currently a developing long-term natural habitat management plan which will help ensure the viability of the diverse on-site ecosystems.
- e. The project will not remove any on-site oak trees. No impacts to native oak trees will result from tree removal, or implementation of the proposed project.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

### 3. AIR QUALITY:

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				√
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.				√
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				√
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				√
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				√

- a. The project will not significantly obstruct the implementation of the SCAQMD air quality management plan. Air quality impacts would likely be beneficial due to increase in riparian vegetation.

- b. The project will not contribute particulate concentrations in excess of the allowable construction emission standards as established by the SCAQMD.
- c. The project will not contribute to net increases in pollutants which are of "non-attainment" status within the South Coast Air Basin.
- d. The project will not contribute pollutant concentrations harmful to sensitive receptors adjacent to the construction area.
- e. The project will not create any objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of nearby residential uses.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**4. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5		√		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5			√	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				√
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			√	
e) Result in physical disruption of an identified sacred place or other ethnographically documented location of significance to native Californians?				√

- a. To date, a cultural resource inventory has not been completed on the proposed project site. However, preliminary archival records research indicates that impacts to cultural and historical resources are anticipated to be less than significant. To verify this conclusion, the City of Calabasas Environmental Coordinator in consultation with other Native American specialists is completing a field investigation to rule out the possibility of significant cultural and heritage resources prior to the commencement of project activities.
- b. The proposed project will not result in significant impacts to paleontological or geologic resources. These fluvial studies and subsequent soft-channel improvements will not require grading and thus will not result in the exposure of sensitive paleontological or geologic resources.
- c. Impacts to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries are not anticipated. In the event that remains are unearthed, construction shall be halted until the county coroner or other qualified professional has properly identified and relocated the remains.

- d. The project site is not located within an identified sacred place or other ethnographically documented area. Therefore, impacts to significant ethnographic areas will be less than significant.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**5. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				√
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				√
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				√
(iv) Landslides?				√
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			√	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				√
d) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				√
e) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				√
f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				√
g) Result in remediation scars (benched slopes, etc.) whose dimensions cannot be predicted with reasonable accuracy based on a preliminary geotechnical report?				√

- a. The project is not situated in an area known to contain an earthquake fault or in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake special study zone. Therefore, the risk of fault rupture is less than significant.
- b. The project can be expected to lose minor amounts of topsoil or contribute to erosional conditions particularly if streambed improvements are implemented during the winter months. Increased sedimentation/deposition rates from project construction are considered less than significant with the inclusion of standard NPDES best management practices.
- c. The project will not destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature.



- d. Development projects in the general area are often underlain by geologic and soil conditions conducive to slope failure. However, the proposed hydrologic and hydraulic studies will be completed in soil substrates consisting primarily of alluvium located in a floodplain environment with slopes ranging from 0-5 percent. Therefore, slope failures are not anticipated.
- e. A soil expansion study has not yet been provided, but due to the high sand content inherent to the native soils in a streambed environment, impacts resulting from highly expansive soils are not considered significant.
- f. Soils non-conductive to septic tank functionality may be present on-site. However, these soils are outside of the proposed study area. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
- g. The proposed stream enhancement will not require the construction of cut and fill slopes as a component of the implementations. Therefore, impacts resulting from remedial scars are not anticipated to be significant.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**6. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project?

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?				√
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?				√
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an exiting or proposed school?				√
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				√
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				√
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				√
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				√
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				√

- a. The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. No hazardous materials are allowed on-site.
- b. The project will not likely release hazardous materials into the environment.
- c. The project will not emit hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- d. The project site is not located in an area in which hazardous materials sites are located.
- e. The project is not located within an airport land use plan.
- f. The project is not within the vicinity of an airstrip.
- g. The project will not interfere with an emergency response or emergency evacuation plan.
- h. The project will not expose people and structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**7. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			√	
b) Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			√	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?			√	
d) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			√	
e) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				√
f) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			√	
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			√	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				√
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				√

- a. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The proposed project will likely improve water quality within the existing riparian drainages traversing the site once the proposed enhancements are completed.

- b.** The proposed project will not substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The anticipated increases infiltration/percolation rates will likely improve the groundwater recharge volumes.
- c.** The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site. A component of the project includes the restoration of the existing riparian drainages flowing through the site (see description of the proposed improvements above). The introduction of native vegetation and bank reinforcement will likely reduce runoff quantities and on/off-site flooding frequencies thereby improving existing drainage conditions.
- d.** The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The goal of the stream restoration program is to decrease wastewater discharge volumes so that the functionality of the streambed ecosystem is improved.
- e.** The proposed project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The introduction of additional riparian vegetation combined with other stormwater filtration improvements will increase the level of filtration for stormwater flows and will likely improve water quality.
- f.** The proposed project will be required to consult with FEMA to document whether any of the existing or proposed structures will be placed within a 100-year floodplain.
- g.** The proposed project will not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows.
- h.** The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- i.** The proposed project will not promote Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**8. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

a) Obstruct any scenic vista or view open to the public or will the proposal result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive development open to public view?				√
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				√
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings?				√
d) Create sources of incompatibility with the existing scenic and aesthetic environment of the community or quality of life impacts on residents?				√
e) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day views in the area?				√
f) Significantly impact any existing streetscape or public space which has been designed to provide areas of public assembly and congregation?				√
g) Conflict with adopted design guidelines or development standards which have been implemented to improve the quality of architecture in the community?				√

The proposed project will not involve the construction of additional structures having the potential to impact views along the Mulholland Scenic Corridor. Ultimately, the project is anticipated to have a beneficial effect on the general environmental aesthetic through enhancement of the adjacent streambed environment.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**9. MINERAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				√
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				√

The completion of these studies will not consume any natural resources beyond those necessary to serve the project. A local mineral resources map was consulted to identify any possible minerals present in the proposed project area. The map did not forecast any losses to potentially valuable mineral resources would be experienced due to project completion.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**10 NOISE.** Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				√
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				√
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or in rural areas, increase measurably the ambient noise levels more than 5 dbs?				√
d) A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				√
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				√
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				√

- a. The proposed project will not expose persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The proposed streambed improvements will not involve the use of heavy equipment and thus will not create objectionable sources of noise.
- b. The proposed project will not expose persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- c. The proposed project will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or in rural areas.
- d. The proposed project will not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- e. The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

- f. The project is not located near an airstrip.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**11. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

a) Result in impacts to an established ethnic community?				√
b) Create substantial demands for affordable low income housing in a jurisdiction which does not have an adequate stock of such housing?				√
c) Result in substantial conflicts between type, size, and quality of proposed and existing housing in the project vicinity?				√
d) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				√

The completion of the proposed restoration project will not result in any growth induced impacts to neighboring residential communities.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**12. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?				√
b) Police protection?				√
c) Schools?				√
d) Parks?				√
e) Other public facilities?				√

Impacts to local public service agencies are not anticipated to be significant. The completion of the proposed studies would not increase demands on educational, park or other public facilities.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**13. RECREATION.** Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				√
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				√

The completion of the proposed studies will not substantially increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks in the surrounding areas. The project will not involve the expansion or construction of recreational facilities on-site.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**14. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				√
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency or City General Plan Circulation Element threshold?				√
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				√
d) Substantially increase hazards related to existing intersections or roadway design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. residential traffic conflicts with farm equipment)?				√
e) Result in inadequate secondary or emergency access?				√
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				√
g) Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				√

Completion of the proposed studies will not impact traffic along the surrounding transportation routes. No road closures or other types of congestion generating activities would occur as a result of the proposed streambed restoration project.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**15. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			√	
b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				√
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				√
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				√
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				√
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs for a minimum ten-year period?				√
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				√
h) Provide for on-site source separation and recycling facilities which are adequately sized for the proposed use?				√

The completion of the proposed project will not result in impacts to existing utilities or public infrastructure. The goal of this stream restoration project is to reduce the burden placed on down-stream hard channel improvements, improve water quality, and create a self-sustaining riparian ecosystem. Once completed, the project will likely have a beneficial impact on existing utilities and service systems.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

i) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			√	
---	--	--	---	--



j) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			√	
k) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			√	

**No mandatory findings of significance are applicable to the project.**